

## **Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 73**

KEEPING TEENS SAFE IS A PRIMARY CONCERN TO PARENTS, BUT Prop 73's proponents believe government can force teens to communicate with their parents. Who's kidding who? FAMILY COMMUNICATION CAN'T BE "REQUIRED" BY GOVERNMENT. Talking to our daughters about responsible sexual behavior when they're young is the best way to protect them.

In fact, MOST TEENS DO TALK TO THEIR PARENTS, BUT SOME JUST CAN'T **SAFELY**. Proponents are **wrong** when they say those teens can **easily go to court**. IT'S UNREASONABLE TO EXPECT VULNERABLE, SCARED TEENAGERS FROM ABUSIVE FAMILIES TO SIMPLY "GO TO COURT." California courtrooms are crowded; these teens don't need to be put on trial.

The proponents are **wrong** when they assert that internet predators and statutory rapists will be deterred from their despicable actions by new laws like these. THAT'S PREPOSTEROUS – it's just included to scare voters.

What proponents don't tell you is this law FORCES DOCTORS TO REPORT these procedures TO THE GOVERNMENT – why does government need to know? They've also slipped into their initiative language adding "unborn child, a child conceived but not born" to our Constitution. What does that have to do with notification? We don't know.

What we do know is that THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT, looking at the experience of other states with similar laws, CONCLUDED THAT THE EVIDENCE "OVERWHELMINGLY" SHOWS THESE LAWS DO NOT SUPPORT FAMILIES, BUT IN FACT, PUT TEENAGERS IN DANGER.

California's League of Women Voters, medical experts and millions of concerned parents urge you to VOTE NO.

Visit [www.NoOnProposition73.org](http://www.NoOnProposition73.org).

Signers:

1. Deborah Burger, RN, President, California Nurses Association
2. Kathy Kneer, CEO, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
3. A. Eric Ramos, M.D., President, California Academy of Family Physicians

**SUBJECT TO COURT  
ORDERED CHANGES**